

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-6996**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

MICHAEL ANTHONY EDWARDS, a/k/a Teddy Reid,  
a/k/a Lancel Reid,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Graham C. Mullen, Chief  
District Judge. (CR-98-294-MU)

---

Submitted: November 12, 2003

Decided: December 17, 2003

---

Before MICHAEL and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Anthony Edwards, Appellant Pro Se. C. Nicks Williams,  
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina,  
for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Michael Anthony Edwards filed an "application for certificate of appealability of defendant's sentencing guidelines level and enhancement" in the district court, which the district court docketed as a notice of appeal. The district court, however, has not issued any final orders in Edwards's case since entry of the judgment of conviction and sentence on December 18, 2000, which we affirmed. See United States v. Edwards, No. 01-4030, 2002 WL 431859 (4th Cir. Mar. 20, 2002) (unpublished). In this court, Edwards has filed a "motion for correction of sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255." We dismiss the motion because we lack jurisdiction to consider it.

A motion for correction of sentence pursuant to § 2255 must be filed in "the court which imposed the sentence." 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000). The statute further provides that "[a]n appeal may be taken to the court of appeals from the order entered on the motion as from a final judgment on application for a writ of habeas corpus." Id. Edwards's motion is not properly brought in this court.

Accordingly, we dismiss Edwards's motion for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED